



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and the date when he composed the second article on Johnson. The classes of words excluded from the computation are the six categories designated in the paper on De Quincey, in the February number of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES. The number of words examined is 5,000 from each essay.

ESSAY ON HISTORY.

A—PROXIMATE DERIVATION.

	No. of Words.	Percentage.
French.....	2,599	51.98
Germanic.....	1,566	31.32
Latin.....	774	15.48
Greek.....	38	.76
Celtic.....	16	.32
Romance Languages exclusive of French....	7	.14

B—ULTIMATE DERIVATION.

	No. of Words.	Percentage.
Latin.....	2,939	58.78
Germanic.....	1,606	32.12
Greek.....	400	8.00
Celtic.....	26	.52
All Romance Languages...	20	.40
Slavonic.....	4	.08
Oriental.....	4	.08
West Indian.....	1	.02

ARTICLE ON JOHNSON.

A—PROXIMATE DERIVATION.

	No. of Words.	Percentage.
French.....	2,177	43.54
Germanic.....	2,099	41.98
Latin.....	630	12.60
Celtic.....	41	.82
Greek.....	31	.62
Romance Languages exclusive of French....	11	.22
Oriental.....	11	.22

B—ULTIMATE DERIVATION.

	No. of Words.	Percentage.
Latin.....	2,489	49.78
Germanic.....	2,128	42.56
Greek.....	259	5.18
Celtic.....	54	1.08
All Romance Languages...	32	.64
Oriental.....	31	.62
Slavonic.....	7	.14

In the former essay, Macaulay employed 1,491 words of Old English origin; in the latter, 1,949,—a gain of 9.16 per cent. This corresponds nearly to the difference between the Germanic (ultimate) of the earlier and that of the later period (10.44 per cent), the other factors remaining substantially unchanged, with the exception of Scandinavian, which shows a gain of 1.28 per cent. Latin (ultimate) recedes in nearly the same ratio as Germanic encroaches, the loss being 9.00 per cent, French (proximate) corresponding very closely, with a loss of 8.44 per cent.

Referring to the paper on De Quincey, it will be seen that he uses 41.13 per cent of native English words; in the Essay on History, Macaulay uses 29.82 per cent, and in that on Samuel Johnson, 38.98 per cent. De Quincey is therefore more Anglican than Macaulay at his best, a conclusion quite borne out by the percentages of De Mille, which are 82 and 76 respectively.

ALBERT S. COOK.

University of California.

THE OATHS OF STRASBURG.

L. CLÉDAT (*Revue des Langues Rom.* Oct. 1885, pp. 309-10) proposes to read *et in aiudha [li] er in cadhuna cosa* "et je lui serai en aide en chaque chose" instead of *& in aiudha & in cadhuna cosa* "et en aide et en chaque chose" changing thus *&* into *er* (Lat. *ero*) and adding *li*. I cannot approve of this emendation for two reasons especially:

1. The passage would now read thus: *si salvarai eo cist meon fradre Karlo, et in aiudha er in cadhuna cosa, sicum per dreit son fradra salvar dist.* Thus the first clause "*si salvarai eo c. m. fradre K.*" is separated from its complement "*si cum p. d. son fradra salvar dist*" by a whole clause, which introduces a new idea and which has no similar complement. Such a construction would hardly be accepted if it were the reading of the unique manuscript. I prefer therefore to regard, according to the manuscript reading, *si salvarai cadhuna cosa* as one sentence and *et in aiudha et in cadhuna cosa* as an adverbial attribute to *salvarai eo*.

2. The German text confirms the reading of the manuscript and this is of some weight as the German Oaths follow closely the French

text. It is true, the words *et in aiudha et in cadhuna cosa* are not in the corresponding German passage, but as they are only an unnecessary attribute of the verb *salvar** (unnecessary, because *salvar* taken in its general acceptance is synonymous with *salvar in cadhuna cosa*) their omission is of no consequence. It is quite different when we read with Clédat *et in aiudha er in cadhuna cosa*. Then this attribute which could be left out has become a new clause conveying a new idea. The supposition that a whole sentence of the French Oath could have been omitted in the German text, is something I cannot admit.

After these objections I think it unnecessary to insist upon the graphical difficulties (which are greater than M. Clédat intimates), and upon the fact that his correction makes another emendation necessary, namely, the insertion of the pronoun *li*.

J. STÜRZINGER.

Bryn Mawr College.

A History of German Literature, by W. SCHERER. Translated from the third German edition by MRS. F. C. CONYBEARE, edited by F. MAX MÜLLER. New York, 1886. 2 vols. 12mo. Charles Scribner's Sons.

The reviewer may well feel satisfaction and pleasure in undertaking his office on the present occasion. The long felt want of a good history of German literature in English has finally been met by an excellent translation of the best work now existing in the German language.

The marvellous success of Prof. Scherer's book in Germany has been well deserved. It had to compete not only with works of long standing and good repute, but also with those literary picture-books which have recently become so fashionable. The fact, however, that within four years four editions have been called for is sufficient proof of the principal merit of Scherer's work: its originality.

A reform in the method of writing the history of literature was very much needed. The manufacturers of those books which annually crowd the German market borrowed not only the ma-

terial but the form from their great masters: Gervinus, Koberstein, Wackernagel, and Kurz. But these, though priceless treasures for the student and investigator, do not meet the present requirements of historical science. History written with political or religious tendencies is scarcely scientific, nor will the scientific compilation of facts be called history. If the history of literature deals with the ideal life of a nation as reflected in its poetry, if the laws of historical investigation must be applied to represent this, then it seems almost obvious what method is to be followed. We do not look for a careful, chronological enumeration of all the documents, as we find it in Koberstein and Kurz, for that may be left to the notes; we do not care merely for the brilliant but disconnected reflections and criticisms of a powerful mind like Gervinus; we want an *organic representation* of the national poetic development. For in spite of rise and decline in the poetical history of a nation, the true historian believes in development, and although he cannot account altogether for the sudden appearance of great poets, he will not yield, like Vilmar, to the superstitious belief in the miraculous powers of genius.

Prof. Scherer is especially called to write a history of literature. Long ago he was known as an excellent philologist trained in Lachmann-Müllenhoff's school, and we can see by numerous acute observations how much benefit he derives from his philological knowledge in the way of throwing light upon his subject. A number of monographs, giving the results of his researches in different periods of German literature, have provided him with the knowledge of detail necessary for the historian who disdains to copy his predecessors. The author commands a charming style, which, though at times somewhat too journalistic, appeals to the wide circle of the educated. For, unlike some of his anchoretic colleagues, he is aware that science, unless brought into connection with national life, becomes Alexandrianism, and life without science ends in barbarism. And above all Prof. Scherer is endowed with the gift that places the historian next to the poet. He knows how to penetrate the spirit of a period as well as that of an individual, he understands how to find the secret connection of movements and motives back of

*The German word for *salvar* is *haldan*; both mean "to sustain" and not "to defend" as M. Clédat has it.